IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 302 of 1992

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH
and
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

UNITED PHOSPHOROUS LIMITED

Versus

UNION OF INDIA

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 302 of 1992
MR ASHOK L SHAH for Petitioner No. 1
SERVED BY RPAD for respondent No.1
RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 2-3

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH
and
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

Date of decision: 15/07/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

(Per : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH)

In this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner had prayed for a writ directing the respondents to decide the petitioner's

application dated 13.3.1990 for issuance of licence in prescribed Form L-6. The second prayer for direction to the respondents to decide the impugned show cause notice dated 15.3.1990 was really speaking merely a consequential relief because by the said show cause notice the respondents had called upon the petitioner to show cause why the petitioner's application dated 13.3.1990 should not be dismissed.

2. Notice was issued on this petition on 17.1.1992 and after hearing both the parties, this Court admitted the petition and by interim order dated 30.1.1992 granted the interim relief as prayed for i.e. to direct the respondents to decide the aforesaid application dated 13.3.1990 and the impugned show cause notice dated 15.3.1990, by 30.3.1992. Thus, all the reliefs which the petitioner had prayed for came to be granted by the interim order.

3. Today, when the petition is called out, Mr Ashok L Shah, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has no instructions in the matter. He further states that he has not received any instructions from the petitioner complaining about any outstanding grievance or about non-compliance with the above interim order. Hence, it is reasonable to proceed on the basis that the petitioner's grievance raised in this petition no longer survives and no further orders are required to be passed while disposing of this petition.

4. The petition is, therefore, disposed of as infructuous. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

(M.S. Shah, J.) (D.A. Mehta, J.)

sundar/-